

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
8 AT SEATTLE

9 MARGUERITE L. MARTIN II,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.  
12

13 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al.,

14 Defendants.

Case No. C19-0009 RSM

ORDER DENYING ALL PENDING  
MOTIONS TO INTERVENE

15 This matter comes before the Court on sixteen identical one-page Motions to Join filed  
16 by non-parties. Dkts. #5 through #20. The Court interprets these as motions to intervene  
17 properly brought under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 24.<sup>1</sup> These Motions are identical except  
18 for the name, address, and signature of the individual filing the Motion. The only content in  
19 each is the sentence “[w]ith this petition, I acknowledge the contents of pro se litigant  
20 Marguerite L Martin’s complaint and declare these grievous harms are befalling the American  
21 people to include myself and/or my loved ones,” a citation to *Johnson v. City of Shelby, Miss.*,  
22 743 F.3ed 59, 62 (5th 2013), and the assertion that a pro se plaintiff is not required to set forth  
23 the legal theory supporting the asserted claim for relief. Generally speaking, there are no  
24  
25  
26

27 <sup>1</sup> To the extent these individuals seek to join as parties under the joinder provisions in Federal Rules of Civil  
28 Procedure 19 and 20, such must also be denied. A nonparty cannot on its own motion join as a party under Rule 19  
or 20. *See Thompson v. Boggs*, 33 F.3d 847, 858 n. 10 (7th Cir. 1994), *cert. denied*, 514 U.S. 1063, 115 S. Ct.  
1692, 131 L. Ed. 2d 556 (1995).

1 attachments.<sup>2</sup> It is clear that these are fill-in-the-blank form Motions originally drafted and  
2 distributed by (or with the knowledge of) the named Plaintiff in this case, Marguerite Martin.<sup>3</sup>

3 The Court will first address the legal standard for a motion to intervene. Rule 24  
4 provides for two types of intervention: intervention as of right and permissive intervention.  
5 Under Rule 24(a), a prospective intervenor may intervene as of right when a federal statute  
6 confers an unconditional right to intervene or when the prospective intervenor claims an interest  
7 that may, as a practical matter, be impaired by disposition of the pending action and that interest  
8 is not adequately represented by existing parties. The Ninth Circuit has held that to intervene as  
9 of right, a prospective intervenor must: (1) file a timely motion; (2) identify a significant  
10 protectable interest related to the subject matter of the action; (3) suffer practical impairment of  
11 an interest if intervention is not granted; and (4) be inadequately represented by existing parties.  
12 *Arakaki v. Cayetano*, 324 F.3d 1078, 1083 (9th Cir. 2003). Failure to satisfy any of these  
13 requirements is fatal to a motion to intervene, and the court need not reach the remaining  
14 elements. *Perry v. Proposition 8 Official Proponents*, 587 F.3d 947, 950 (9th Cir. 2009). The  
15 party seeking to intervene bears the burden of showing that all of the requirements for  
16 intervention have been met. *United States v. Alisal Water Corp.*, 370 F.3d 915, 919 (9th Cir.  
17 2004). A proposed intervenor may also intervene by seeking the Court's permission under Rule  
18 24(b). The Ninth Circuit has held that a court may permissively allow intervention when the  
19 prospective intervenor meets three threshold requirements: (1) files a timely application; (2)  
20  
21  
22  
23

---

24  
25 <sup>2</sup> Two individuals have filed letters detailing their personal relationship with chronic pain and pain management.  
26 See Dkt. #14 at 2; Dkt. #19 at 2. The Court notes that these letters are not pleadings and do not otherwise connect  
27 their experiences to the legal claims in this case.

28 <sup>3</sup> The Complaint requests "that all Americans be allowed to join this litigation against the state of Washington and  
the United States of America by submitting a 'Motion to Join' with this case number." Dkt. #1 at 26. One  
individual also attached an instruction sheet advising individuals to simply "fill in the blanks" and mail these form  
Motions to the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Washington. Dkt. #14 at 3. That instruction sheet  
may not have been drafted by Ms. Martin as it is signed "[m]uch luv, soft hugs and many prayers. Respectfully,  
Robert D. Rose Jr." *Id.*

1 shares a common question of law or fact with the main action; and (3) demonstrates that the  
2 court has an independent basis for jurisdiction over the intervenor's claims. *Donnelly v.*  
3 *Glickman*, 159 F.3d 405, 412 (9th Cir. 1998). Unlike intervention as of right, even if all three  
4 requirements are satisfied, the district court has considerable discretion to deny permissive  
5 intervention. *Id.* at 412; Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(b).

6  
7 In any event, Rule 24(c) requires that a motion to intervene "state the grounds for  
8 intervention and be accompanied by a pleading that sets out the claim or defense for which  
9 intervention is sought." Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(c). The Ninth Circuit has approved motions to  
10 intervene without a pleading or with some other technical defect, but only "as long as the  
11 prospective intervenor fully states the legal and factual grounds for intervention." *S.E.C. v.*  
12 *Small Bus. Capital Corp.*, No. 5:12-CV-03237-EJD, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 104233, 2014 WL  
13 3749900, at \*7 n.2 (N.D. Cal. July 29, 2014) (citing *Beckman Indus., Inc. v. Int'l Ins. Co.*, 966  
14 F.2d 470, 474 (9th Cir. 1992) ("Courts, including this one, have approved intervention motions  
15 without a pleading where the court was otherwise apprised of the grounds for the motion.")).  
16  
17

18 As an initial matter, each Motion fails to satisfy the procedural requirements of Rule  
19 24(c). There are no attached pleadings. There are no particular grounds for intervention. There  
20 are no factual details specific to the individual seeking to intervene. On this basis alone, all of  
21 these Motions are properly denied. Any future fill-in-the-blank form motion would also fail this  
22 test, and the Court will strike any such motion it receives by minute order.  
23

24 Nothing in this Order prevents these individuals from filing a proper motion to  
25 intervene. However, the Court cautions the individuals who filed these Motions to consider  
26 whether they can meet the requirements for intervention above before refileing.  
27  
28

1 Having reviewed the relevant briefing and the record, the Court hereby finds and  
2 ORDERS that the Motions to Join, Dkts. #5 through #20, are DENIED. Any future fill-in-the-  
3 blank form motions to join will be stricken by minute order. The Court directs the Clerk to mail  
4 a copy of this Order to the addresses provided by all the above individuals in these Motions and  
5 to Plaintiff Martin.  
6

7 DATED this 1<sup>st</sup> day of February 2019.  
8

9 

10 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ  
11 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28